1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	RICHARD P. POINTER, ESQ., SBN: 86630 HINKLE, JACHIMOWICZ, POINTER & EMANUEL 2007 W. Hedding Street, Suite 100 San Jose, Ca 95128 Telephone: (408) 246-5500 Facsimile: (408) 246-1051 Attorneys for Defendant RAMON LOPEZ-AGUILAR
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION
12 13 14 15 16	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, Vs. RAMON LOPEZ-AGUILAR, Defendant. NO: CR-08-00014-JF STIPULATION AND (PROPOSED) ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE OF STATUS HEARING
18	Defendant, Ramon Lopez-Aguilar., through counsel Richard P. Pointer and the United States
19	through Jeffrey Schenk hereby stipulate to the continuance of the status hearing from September 10,
20	2008, at 9:00 a.m., to October 1, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. It is agreed between the parties that the
21	following reasons exist for this stipulation:
22	(1) Defense counsel is in trial in state court in the matter of <u>People vs. Raymundo Rivera</u> ,
23	case number: CC632875.
24	No party objects to the requested continuance.
25	IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED that the time for trial under the Speedy Trial Act continue

IT IS SO STIPULATED. Respectfully submitted, Dated: September 5, 2008 <u>/s/</u> Richard P. Pointer Attorney for Ramon Lopez-Aguilar Dated: September 5, 2008 Jeffrey Schenk Assistant United States Attorney

RICHARD P. POINTER, ESQ., SBN: 86630 1 HINKLE, JACHIMOWICZ, POINTER & EMANUEL 2007 W. Hedding Street, Suite 100 San Jose, Ca 95128 3 Telephone: (408) 246-5500 Facsimile: (408) 246-1051 4 Attorneys for Defendant 5 RAMON LOPEZ-AGUILAR 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 SAN JOSE DIVISION 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, NO: CR-08-00014-JF 11 Plaintiff, ORDER OF CONTINUANCE 12 **OF STATUS HEARING** VS. 13 RAMON LOPEZ-AGUILAR) 14 Defendant. 15 16 Based on the stipulations of the parties, the court HEREBY ORDERS that the status hearing 17 scheduled for September 10, 2008, at 9:00 am., is continued to October 1, 2008 at 9:00 a.m. 18 THE COURT FURTHER ORDERS time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from 19 September 10, 2008, to October 1, 2008. The court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that 20 the ends of justice is served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the

public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would

deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the

exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore

concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. section 3161(h)(8)(A) and

21

22

23

24

25

(B)(iv).

Dated: 9/9/08

JEREMY FOGE United States Magistrate Judge District